

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed June 1, 2005 (the "Office Action"), and the Advisory Action mailed October 4, 2005 (the "Advisory Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-29 were pending in this patent application. Claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-29 were rejected. Claims 1, 11, 24, and 27 have been amended to more particularly point out the subject matter Applicants consider the invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Section 103(a) Rejections**

Claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,671,737 issued to Snowden et al. ("*Snowdon*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,601 issued to Lambert et al. ("*Lambert*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons discussed below.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited by the Examiner fail to teach, suggest, or disclose each and every claim limitation of Claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-29.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for processing data comprising:  
receiving data at a cache server;  
receiving at a data center manager a data change message from a trigger associated with a data source, the data change message generated in response to a change in the content of the data;  
generating an expiration command at the data center manager in response to the data change message;  
receiving the expiration command at the cache server from the data center manager; and  
marking the data as expired according to the expiration command.

Applicants submit that the *Snowdon-Lambert* combination suggested by the Examiner fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each of these elements. For example, the *Snowdon-Lambert* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose “receiving at a data center a data change message . . . generated in response to a change in the content of the data” (emphasis added) and “generating an expiration command at the data center manager in response to the data change message” (emphasis added). In fact, the portions of *Snowdon* relied upon by the Examiner fail to teach, suggest, or disclose any action taken in response to a change in the data. Instead, *Snowdon* merely describes “the evolution of the state of the pieces of pollen [or data]” in a pollen network between the “new,” “in transit,” “delivered,” “deleted,” and “expired” states. Col. 10, ll. 22-24. According to column 10, lines 22-37 of *Snowdon*:

The pollen state machine controls the evolution of the state of the pieces of pollen. The possible states are: new, in transit, delivered, deleted and expired. A piece of pollen that has just been created by a user is marked as new. A piece of pollen that has been picked up from a first node site and has not yet arrived at all of its destinations, is marked as in transit. A piece of pollen that has been delivered to all of its destinations is marked as delivered. The piece of pollen is marked as delivered when it is known to have arrived at all of its destination nodes; otherwise, it is marked as in transit. When the current date is greater than the piece of pollen’s expiration date, its state is marked as expired. A piece of pollen that has been manually deleted by a user is marked as deleted. (Pollen may be deleted when expired or when delivered and not needed at the destination.)

Therefore, *Snowdon* merely discloses changes in the state of the data. A change in the state of the data, however, is not a change in the content of the data. Because of this, *Snowdon* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose “a data change message . . . generated in response to a change in the content of the data” as recited by Claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 1 is improper, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Similar to Claim 1, Claim 24 recites “receiving at a data center manager . . . a data change message . . . generated in response to a change in the content of the dynamic content item.” Likewise, Claim 27 recites a “data source operable to generate a data change message in response to a change in the content of data associated with the data source.” Therefore,

Applicants submit that Claims 24 and 27 are allowable, for example, for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 24 and 27 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-23; 25 and 26; and 28 and 29 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claims 1, 24, and 27, respectively. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-23, 25, 26, 28, and 29 are allowable, for example, for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claims 1, 24, and 27. As such, Applicant respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-23, 25, 26, 28, and 29 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Attached herewith is a check in the amount of \$385.00 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" to satisfy the request for continued examination fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.117(e) for a small entity.

Applicants respectfully request a two month extension of time and Notification of Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 from September 1, 2005 to November 1, 2005, with appropriate fee in the amount of \$225.00 is attached herewith in support thereof.

Although Applicants believe that no other fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye  
Reg. No. 45,460  
Phone: (214) 953-6494

Date: Oct 27, 2005

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Customer Number: **05073**  
Attorney Docket Number: 066241.0104